

Application No.: 09/827774

Case No.: 56522US002

Remarks

This is in response to the Examiner's action mailed June 15, 2004. Claims 1-40 are pending in the application. Claims 7, 8, 24, 26 through 30, and 32 stand rejected. Applicants thank the examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 1 through 6, 9 through 23, and 33 through 40. Applicants further thank the Examiner for allowing dependent claims 25 and 31 if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 24, 28, 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka (US6,744,558). Regarding claim 24, amended claim 24 is certainly not anticipated by Tanaka. Claim 24 recites a screen having a rear side and a viewing side, either one of which is optically coupled to a transparent window by an adhesive. Tanaka does not teach these limitations. On the contrary, Tanaka discloses a screen, a portion of which (2r) is adhered to one side of a transparent plate, and a remaining portion of which is adhered to the other side of the transparent plate. Accordingly, neither the rear side nor the viewing side of Tanaka's screens is optically coupled to a transparent window.

Regarding claims 28, 29 and 32, since these claims are dependent on claim 24, they are not anticipated by Tanaka either.

For these reasons, claims 24, 28, 29, and 32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Tanaka and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka. In particular, the Examiner states that "Tanaka teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the adhesive being permanent." Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 27 depends from claim 24 which is patentable over Tanaka for the reasons set forth herein. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable over Tanaka at least for the same reasons.

Claims 7, 8 and 26 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Burger (US4,095,013) or Neu (*Lecturing with a notebook computer*). In particular, the Examiner states that Tanaka teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the adhesive being removable. Amended claims 7 and 8 are certainly patentable over the cited references. Claims 7 and 8 recite adhering (claim 7) or attaching (claim 8) the rear or viewing side of a screen on a substantially transparent surface. Tanaka does not teach or suggest these

Application No.: 09/827774

Case No.: 56522US002

limitations. Furthermore, neither Burger nor Neu cure the deficiencies of Tanaka. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are not obvious over the cited references.

Regarding claim 26, this claim depends from claim 24 that is patentable over Tanaka for the reasons set forth herein. Therefore, claim 26 is patentable over Tanaka for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, neither Burger nor Neu cure the deficiencies of Tanaka. Therefore, claim 26 is not obvious over the cited references.

Accordingly, claims 7, 8, and 26 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tanaka in view of Burger or Neu and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Depalma (US3,754,813). In particular, the Examiner states that Tanaka teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for a cutting means to cut the screen to a customize shape. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 30 depends from claim 24 which is patentable over Tanaka for the reasons set forth herein. Therefore, claim 30 is patentable over Tanaka at least for the same reasons. Furthermore, Depalma does not cure the deficiencies of Tanaka. In particular, Depalma does not teach or suggest an adhesive associated with a screen optically coupling rear or viewing side of the screen to a substantially transparent window as claimed by the Applicants. Accordingly, claim 30 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tanaka in view of Depalma and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the present application are patentable over the references cited and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested and an early indication of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

September 1, 2004
Date

By:


Stephen W. Buckingham, Reg. No.: 30,035-
Telephone No.: 651-733-3379

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833